UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/758,980	01/12/2001	George A. Te	FIS920000303US1	2463

7590 07/01/2004

Connolly, Bove, Lodge & Hutz
Suite 800
1990 M Street, N.W.
Washington, DC 20036-3425

EXAMINER	
LAZARO, DAVID R	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	6

DATE MAILED: 07/01/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/758,980	TE, GEORGE A.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	David Lazaro	2155

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *12 January 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-20* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☒ The drawing(s) filed on *28 March 2001* is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *4*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-20 are pending in this Office Action.

Papers Received

2. Formal drawings received 03/28/01, Paper #3.

3. Change of Address received 01/12/01, Paper #5.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 01/12/01, Paper #4, has been considered by the Examiner.

Specification

5. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities:

a. On page 7, line 23, "sent" should be "send".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

6. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

7. Claims 1-5, 7-11, 13 and 17-19 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent 5,884,309 by Vanechanos, Jr. (Vanechanos).

8. With respect to Claim 1, Vanechanos teaches a method for generalized Common Gateway Interface (CGI) processing (Col. 4 lines 48-53), comprising: (a) providing a plurality of distinct CGI forms (Col. 7 lines 5-23, Col. 8 lines 46-52 and See Fig. 3a) on a server connected to a network (Col. 5 lines 59-61); (b) receiving a plurality of distinct user requests over said network (Col. 7 lines 5-23 and Col. 10 lines 44-48); and (c) responding to said requests by invoking a single, generalized CGI processing routine for enabling user data corresponding to said plurality of distinct CGI forms to be entered (Col. 4 lines 48-53 and Col. 5 lines 1-4).

9. With respect to Claim 2, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 1 and further teaches said step (c) comprising: (d) generating a parameter file from a selected CGI form corresponding to a user request (Col. 7 lines 28-36); and (e) presenting said selected CGI form on a display device, to collect user input data corresponding to said selected CGI form (Col. 7 lines 20-23 and lines 28-32).

10. With respect to Claim 3, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 2 and further teaches said step (d) comprising extracting input field names from said selected CGI form (Col. 10 lines 12-15).

11. With respect to Claim 4, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 2 and further teaches reading said user input data based on said parameter file (Col. 11 lines 19-25 and lines 37-39); and formatting said user input data for output to said user (Col. 10 line 64 – Col. 11 line 1).

12. With respect to Claim 5, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 4 and further teaches executing post-processing function to perform additional specified operations on said user input data (Col. 10 lines 49-63); generating an output file including formatted input data and results of said operations (Col. 16 lines 39-51); and reporting a result of said request back to said user (Col. 16 lines 39-51).

13. With respect to Claim 7, Vanechanos teaches a system comprising: a network for transmitting a plurality of user requests to a server (Col. 5 lines 59-61); a server linked to said network (Col. 5 lines 59-61), said server comprising: a plurality of distinct CGI forms (Col. 7 lines 5-23, Col. 8 lines 46-52 and See Fig. 3a) corresponding to said requests (Col. 7 lines 5-23 and Col. 10 lines 44-48); and generalized handling means for handling each of said plurality of distinct CGI forms in response to said requests (Col. 4 lines 48-53 and Col. 5 lines 1-4).

14. With respect to Claim 8, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 7 and further teaches said generalized handling means comprising single initial data-gathering means for generating a plurality of distinct parameter files from said plurality of distinct CGI forms (Col. 7 lines 28-36).

15. With respect to Claim 9, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 8 and further teaches said generalized handling means further comprising single action means for processing said parameter files and performing user-specified operations corresponding thereto (Col. 4 lines 48-53 and Col. 11 lines 19-25 and lines 37-39).

16. With respect to Claim 10, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 9 and further teaches said initial data-gathering means further comprising: means for

retrieving said distinct CGI forms from said server in response to said requests; and means for presenting said distinct CGI forms to a user and accepting corresponding user input data (Col. 7 lines 20-23 and lines 28-32).

17. With respect to Claim 11, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 10 and further teaches said action means further comprising: means for reading said user input data based on said parameter files (Col. 11 lines 19-25 and lines 37-39); means for formatting said user input data (Col. 10 line 64 – Col. 11 line 1); means for calling post-processing functions to perform additional specified operations on said user input data (Col. 10 lines 48-63; means for generating an output file including formatted input data and results of said operations (Col. 16 lines 39-51); and means for reporting a result of a request back to a user (Col. 16 lines 39-51).

18. With respect to Claim 13, Vanechanos teaches in a network linking issuers of requests to a server (Col. 5 lines 59-61) comprising a plurality of distinct CGI forms (Col. 7 lines 5-23, Col. 8 lines 46-52 and See Fig. 3a), a method comprising: (a) in response to a first request, retrieving a first CGI form from said server and presenting said first CGI form to an issuer of said first request (Col. 7 lines 5-23 and Col. 10 lines 44-48); (b) accepting first input data based on said first CGI form and sending said first input data to said server (Col. 9 lines 54-61); (c) in response to a second request, retrieving a second CGI form different from said first CGI form from said server, and presenting said second CGI form to an issuer of said second request (Col. 7 lines 5-23 and Col. 10 lines 44-48); (d) accepting second input data based on said second CGI form and sending said second input data to said server (Col. 9 lines 54-61); and (e) using a single CGI

form handling program of said server for processing both said first and second CGI forms and first and second input data (Col. 4 lines 48-53 and Col. 5 lines 1-4).

19. With respect to Claim 17, Vanechanos teaches a computer program product tangibly embodied on a computer-usable medium, said computer program product comprising computer-executable instructions which when executed implement a process comprising: (a) providing a plurality of distinct CGI forms (Col. 7 lines 5-23, Col. 8 lines 46-52 and See Fig. 3a) on a server connected to a network (Col. 5 lines 59-61); (b) receiving a plurality of distinct user requests over said network (Col. 7 lines 5-23 and Col. 10 lines 44-48); and (c) responding to said requests by invoking a single, generalized CGI processing routine for enabling user data corresponding to said plurality of distinct CGI forms to be entered (Col. 4 lines 48-53 and Col. 5 lines 1-4).

20. With respect to Claim 18, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 17 and further teaches said step (c) comprising: (d) generating a parameter file from a selected CGI form corresponding to a user request (Col. 7 lines 28-36); and (e) presenting said selected CGI form on a display device, to collect user input data corresponding to said selected CGI form (Col. 7 lines 20-23 and lines 28-32).

21. With respect to Claim 19, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 18 and further teaches executing post-processing function to perform additional specified operations on said user input data (Col. 10 lines 49-63); generating an output file including formatted input data and results of said operations (Col. 16 lines 39-51); and reporting a result of said request back to said user (Col. 16 lines 39-51).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

22. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

23. Claims 6, 12, 14-16 and 20 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Vanechanos in view of "FormRunner! Documentation" by Wintergreen Associates, from the June 10, 1998 Internet archive of www.formrunner.com (FormRunner).

24. With respect to Claim 6, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 5 and further teaches said post-processing functions include calculations based on said user input (Col. 16 lines 39-51) and transmitting an output file to a targeted user (Col. 17 lines 54-60 and Col. 6 lines 6-9). Vanechanos does not explicitly disclose transmitting by dispatching electronic mail. FormRunner teaches the ability to send formatted form data through electronic mail (Page 2 of 3 of the "Introduction" section, specifically Items 3-7 and the last paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Vanechanos and modify it as indicated by FormRunner such that the method further comprises dispatching electronic mail transmitting said output file to a targeted user. One would be motivated to have this as there is need for being able to provide customized

responses to form processing (Page 2 of 3 of the "Introduction" section in FormRunner, 1st paragraph after '9').

25. With respect to Claim 12, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 11 and further teaches said post-processing functions include calculations based on said user input (Col. 16 lines 39-51) and transmitting an output file to a targeted user (Col. 17 lines 54-60 and Col. 6 lines 6-9). Vanechanos does not explicitly disclose transmitting by dispatching electronic mail. FormRunner teaches the ability to send formatted form data through electronic mail (Page 2 of 3 of the "Introduction" section, specifically Items 3-7 and the last paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the system disclosed by Vanechanos and modify it as indicated by FormRunner such that the system further comprises dispatching electronic mail transmitting said output file to a targeted user. One would be motivated to have this as there is need for being able to provide customized responses to form processing (Page 2 of 3 of the "Introduction" section in FormRunner, 1st paragraph after '9').

26. With respect to Claim 14, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 13 and further teaches step (e) comprising: executing the same initial data gathering routine for each of said first and second requests (Col. 4 lines 48-53 and Col. 5 lines 1-4), said initial data gathering routine comprising the steps of: generating a parameter file that has the input fields of a corresponding CGI form (Col. 7 lines 28-36); displaying the corresponding CGI form on a display device (Col. 7 lines 20-23 and lines 28-32); and generating a submitted CGI form by recording inputs to said corresponding CGI form via

said display device (Col. 9 lines 54-61). Vanechanos generally teaches the data patterns received from a submitted form will be compared against the parameter file containing the input fields of the form to determine which fields to process (Col. 4 lines 21-25 and see Claim 3). In this manner, a single, maintainable CGI program can be implemented (Col. 4 line 48 – Col. 5 line 4). Vanechanos does not explicitly disclose parsing input fields of the form to generate the parameter file. However, FormRunner shows a form can be parsed to determine the input fields (Section 2.3 on Page 7 of Section 2 – Item number 1). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method of Vanechanos and modify it as indicated by FormRunner such that the method further comprises parsing input fields in the corresponding CGI form to generate a parameter file. One would be motivated to have this as there is need for a highly maintainable CGI program that can efficiently interface with multiple web server applications (Col. 4 lines 6-9 of Vanechanos).

27. With respect to Claim 15, Vanechanos in view of FormRunner teaches all the limitations of Claim 14 and further teaches said step (e) further comprising: following said initial data gathering routine, executing the same data processing routine for each of said first and second requests (Col. 4 lines 48-53 and Col. 5 lines 1-4 of Vanechanos), said data processing routine comprising the steps of: (f) reading said parameter file to determine which fields of said submitted CGI form to process (Col. 11 lines 19-24 and lines 37-39 of Vanechanos); (g) formatting data in fields determined according to step (f) (Col. 14 lines 57-64 of Vanechanos); and (h) returning a result of

said request to an issuer of said request (Col. 15 lines 37-42 and Col. 16 lines 3-52 of Vanechanos).

28. With respect to Claim 16, Vanechanos in view of FormRunner teaches all the limitations of Claim 5. Vanechanos further teaches executing a post-processing program, said post-processing program performing operations on said inputs (Col. 16 lines 39-51) and sending an output file generated by said post-processing program to a target recipient (Col. 17 lines 54-60 and Col. 6 lines 6-9). Vanechanos does not explicitly disclose sending the output file to an electronic mail address. FormRunner teaches the ability to send formatted form data to the electronic mail address of a target recepient (Page 2 of 3 of the "Introduction" section, specifically Items 3-7 and the last paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the method disclosed by Vanechanos and modify it as indicated by FormRunner such that the method further comprises sending an output file generated by said post-processing program to an electronic mail address of a target recipient. One would be motivated to have this as there is need for being able to provide customized responses to form processing (Page 2 of 3 of the "Introduction" section in FormRunner, 1st paragraph after '9').

29. With respect to Claim 20, Vanechanos teaches all the limitations of Claim 19 and further teaches said post-processing functions include calculations based on said user input (Col. 16 lines 39-51) and transmitting an output file to a targeted user (Col. 17 lines 54-60 and Col. 6 lines 6-9). Vanechanos does not explicitly disclose transmitting by dispatching electronic mail. FormRunner teaches the ability to send formatted form

data through electronic mail (Page 2 of 3 of the "Introduction" section, specifically Items 3-7 and the last paragraph). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to take the program-product disclosed by Vanechanos and modify it as indicated by FormRunner such that the program-product further comprises dispatching electronic mail transmitting said output file to a targeted user. One would be motivated to have this as there is need for being able to provide customized responses to form processing (Page 2 of 3 of the "Introduction" section in FormRunner, 1st paragraph after '9').

Conclusion

30. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

31. U.S. Patent Application Publication 2001/0005863 by Schrier et al. "System for performing radiative transfer communications" June 28, 2001. Discloses a sequence of automated forms being processed by one CGI script instead of a separate script for each one.

32. U.S. Patent 6,345,278 by Hitchcock et al. "Universal Forms Engine" February 5, 2002. Discloses a front end for a "forms engine" that is implemented by one CGI program.

33. Venkitachalam et al. "High Performance Comman Gateway Interface Invocation" Dept. of Computer Science, State Univ. of New York, Stony Brook, NY. IEEE workshop on Internet Applications. July 1999. Pages 4-8. Discloses integration of CGI

functions/scripts into a shared library such that CGI processes run from the same address space of the Web server. Could be considered a "generalized" CGI processing routine.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to David Lazaro whose telephone number is 703-305-4868. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Hosain Alam can be reached on 703-308-6662. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

David Lazaro
June 22, 2004

Patrice Winder
PATRICE WINDER
PRIMARY EXAMINER